Healthcare: A Reasonable Solution

by Patrick Birbarah & Gemini
PhD in Engineering
October 2025

Abstract

The debate surrounding essential healthcare often conflates moral imperatives with economic realities. This paper rejects purely subjective moral framing and posits that essential healthcare must be evaluated through the rigorous lens of **social and economic reasoning**. The analysis begins by demonstrating, through the principles of perfect competition, fundamental and systematic **market failures** (**Section II**). It then argues for the necessity of private incentives by examining the role of **meritocracy, innovation, and talent** in human progress (**Section III**). The pragmatic solution proposed, **The Two-Tier Compromise**, removes the market from the social contract floor while strategically leveraging private innovation and competition for supplemental services (**Section IV**).

I. Introduction

The provision of healthcare globally is frequently characterized as a zero-sum conflict between two ideological positions: healthcare as an **inherent human right** and healthcare as a **market commodity**. This paper argues that this dichotomy is false and distracting. A stable, productive, and functioning society requires a set of obligations—the **social contract**—which ensures the collective well-being of its members. **Essential healthcare** is one such obligation as it does not obey healthy market conditions. **Enhanced healthcare**, however, is not. It should be purchased and would follow healthy market conditions.

II. Perfect Competition and the Three Failures of Essential Care

The concept of **Perfect Competition** serves as the objective benchmark for efficient resource allocation. A market functioning optimally must adhere to five core criteria. **Essential, life-saving healthcare** systematically violates the three most critical of these rules, demonstrating that it can't be left to unregulated market forces.

The Rules of a Healthy Market (Perfect Competition)

- **Numerous Buyers and Sellers:** All entities are price-takers.
- **Homogeneous Products:** Products are identical and substitutable.
- **Perfect Mobility:** Firms and capital can easily enter or exit.
- **Perfect Information (Symmetry):** All parties possess complete and equal knowledge.
- **Absence of Externalities:** All costs and benefits are contained within the transaction.

Market Failure Analysis

Essential healthcare fundamentally breaks the following market conditions:

A. Failure 1: Information Asymmetry (Violation of Rule #4)

In healthcare, the **provider (seller)** is the expert, while the **patient (buyer)** is often uninformed, distressed, and unable to judge the necessity or quality of the service being recommended. This **Information Asymmetry** leads directly to **Supplier-Induced Demand**, where the provider controls both supply and demand, resulting in inefficient, inflated, and often excessive utilization of services.

B. Failure 2: Inelastic Demand (Violation of Rules #1 & #2)

A healthy market requires **elastic demand**. Essential healthcare lacks this elasticity due to:

- **No Substitutes:** There is no functional substitute for a needed surgery or life-saving medication like insulin. The price of non-consumption is death or severe disability.
- **Urgency:** Care is frequently demanded immediately (emergency).

This combination eliminates the buyer's negotiating leverage, granting the seller massive power to **price-gouging**, which directly causes the crisis of high costs and medical debt seen in fragmented systems.

C. Failure 3: Negative Externalities (Violation of Rule #5)

The decision by an individual to forgo care creates **Negative Externalities**, or social costs borne by third parties not involved in the original transaction:

- **Uncompensated Care:** Hospitals are mandated to provide emergency care regardless of ability to pay, transferring the financial burden to insured patients via higher prices.
- **Public Health:** A lack of coverage for contagious illness (e.g., lack of vaccination) impacts the health, safety, and productivity of the entire community.

Because the individual transaction doesn't account for these vast social costs, the market can't achieve an efficient or equitable outcome.

III. The Indispensable Engine: Meritocracy, Innovation, and Talent

While essential care fails as a free market, completely abandoning competition leads to stagnation, inefficiency, and lack of innovation. To understand why competition and reward-based systems are necessary—and why they must be preserved in the **supplemental sector**—we must acknowledge their foundation in **fundamental human nature**.

The Merit Principle and the Natural Order

The drive to work, specialize, and compete for superior reward isn't merely an economic convention; it's a core mechanism of human and biological survival.

- **Work for Survival Analogy:** In the natural world, survival is inherently **merit-based**. An organism must expend effort (work) to secure resources (food, shelter). This fundamental design—that effort dictates outcome—is what drives efficiency and advancement.
- **The Social Contract and Productivity:** A successful society, by extension, must appeal to this drive. If there's no reward differential for specialized skill, risk-taking, or exceptional effort, the incentive to achieve high-level expertise (like becoming a world-class surgeon or a cutting-edge researcher) collapses. **Work-based and merit-based rewards** are therefore a necessary component of the social contract designed for a **productive** society, not just a **stable** one.

Driving Innovation through Private Incentives

This core human incentive is channeled into specialized quality and medical advancement through the private sector:

- **Research and Development (R&D):** Developing a new drug or medical device is an expensive, decade-long gamble. The potential for massive financial reward, secured through strong **intellectual property protections** (patents), is the necessary incentive to attract the capital required for this high-risk, high-reward innovation.
- **Efficiency in Elective Services:** Competition forces private providers to innovate on delivery, offering greater convenience, speed, and specialized service (e.g., streamlined outpatient surgical centers). When the demand is for convenience (a commodity), the **meritocratic market** is highly effective.
- **Specialization and Talent: Reward systems** (higher salaries, better facilities) act as a magnet, attracting the most talented medical professionals to dedicate years to mastering complex skills, thus fostering centers of excellence that advance surgical techniques and complex care.

The challenge is capturing this innovative, merit-driven spirit without allowing it to exploit basic human need. This necessity leads directly to **The Two-Tier Compromise**.

IV. The Two-Tier Compromise

A reasonable sustainable resolution is **The Two-Tier Compromise** that strictly separates the public **Social Contract Floor (Tier 1)** from the private **Commodity Market (Tier 2)**.

A. Tier 1: The Public, Universal Foundation

This tier is universally guaranteed and funded by mandatory taxation, free or low-cost at the point of delivery. It's the regulatory intervention required to correct the economic market failures.

- **Scope (The Essential Basket):** All care defined by medical necessity and public health impact, including emergency care, basic hospitalization, preventative screenings, and standard treatments for chronic/acute disease.
- **Role of Public Funds:** The government acts as the **single buyer (monopsony)** for this basket of services. This leverage negotiates standardized, rational prices for drugs and procedures, directly addressing the inelastic demand crisis.
- **Public R&D:** Public funds (e.g., NIH) focus on basic science, epidemiological research, and treatments for high-cost public health crises (e.g., pandemic threats).

B. Tier 2: The Optional, Supplemental Market

This tier is funded by optional private insurance and individual out-of-pocket payments. Market principles are encouraged here to drive consumer choice, convenience, and luxury.

- **Scope (The Premium Upgrades):** Services defined by discretionary choice, including paying to bypass public wait lists for non-urgent elective procedures, private hospital rooms, luxury amenities, and cosmetic procedures not deemed medically necessary.
- **Role of Private Insurance:** Private insurers are confined to providing these supplemental benefits, making the market more competitive and efficient for **optional perks** rather than necessities.
- **Private R&D:** Specialized technological development and clinical trials are primarily private, utilizing the patent system for necessary risk-reward. Once a breakthrough transitions to a standard, essential treatment, it must move to the public **Tier 1** basket.

C. Boundary Maintenance

The success of **The Two-Tier Compromise** hinges on maintaining a **sharp, non-porous boundary**. Everyone is guaranteed the care needed for a healthy, functional life (**Tier 1**). Competition and financial reward are reserved for comfort, convenience, and the innovation (**Tier 2**) that ultimately elevates the health foundation for all citizens.

V. Conclusion

The persistent and often acrimonious debate over healthcare can only be resolved by abandoning emotional or purely ideological framing in favor of **economic and social reasoning**. This paper has demonstrated that essential healthcare is not a healthy market commodity due to its systemic failure across three critical criteria: **information asymmetry**, **inelastic demand**, and **negative externalities**. Leaving life-saving care to market forces is fundamentally unsustainable, leading directly to exploitation, inefficiency, and societal instability.

A pragmatic and reasonable solution is **The Two-Tier Compromise**. This model acknowledges the **dual mandate** of a modern healthcare system: it must ensure equitable access to the social contract floor while simultaneously harnessing the dynamic power of **meritocracy, reward, and private incentive** to drive medical advancement. By maintaining a **sharp, non-porous boundary**, this compromise achieves the following:

1. **Guarantees the Essential Floor (Tier 1):** It secures the fundamental right to health for all citizens by using government monopsony power to correct market failures, control costs, and ensure universal coverage for necessary care.
2. **Preserves the Engine of Innovation (Tier 2):** It channels the natural human drive for excellence and reward into a **supplemental market**, where competition fuels innovation, luxury, and efficiency for non-essential services, which ultimately benefits the entire system as advanced procedures transition into the essential basket.

The Two-Tier Compromise is not a choice between rights and markets; it is a structural redesign that uses the appropriate economic mechanism for the appropriate service. By securing the essentials outside the profit motive and encouraging competition for the non-essentials, this model offers a **reasonable solution** that is economically sound, morally defensible, and structurally capable of providing a stable foundation for a productive society.